DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 090 CS 509 112

AUTHOR Barrett, Janice M.
TITLE Student and Teacher Perspectives on Channel One: A Qualitative Study of Participants in Massachusetts and Florida Schools.
PUB DATE Aug 95
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (78th, Washington, DC, August 9-12, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Critical Viewing; Interviews; *Mass Media Use; Qualitative Research; Secondary Education; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; Television Research; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Channel One; Florida; Focus Groups; Massachusetts; Middle School Students

ABSTRACT

A study of Channel One, the 10 minutes of television news programs and 2 minutes of commercials in classrooms, described the opinions and evaluative comments of participant teachers, librarians, administrators, and students. Individual interviews and focus group discussions were conducted at eight secondary schools (four in Florida and four in Massachusetts) over a 16-month period. Use of Channel One was also observed in the classrooms. Results indicated that the benefits of Channel One are student-heightened interest in geography, current events, and pop quizzes; and that the disadvantages are the commercials, the superficial programming, the intrusion into the school day, the lack of integration into the curriculum, the lack of inclusion of teachers in the policy decision to contract with Channel One, and the superficial television emphasis on visuals, graphics, and motion. Results also indicated that Channel One appeared to be most appropriate for middle school students. Recommendations include involving teachers in the decision-making process regarding Channel One, targeting a middle-school audience, encouraging teachers to develop curriculum units for critical viewing of Channel One, and developing assessment and evaluation procedures for Channel One's use and its effectiveness. (Contains 87 references.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 090

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Barrett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Student and Teacher Perspectives on Channel One : A Qualitative Study of Participants in Massachusetts and Florida Schools

Assisstant Professor Janice M. Barrett
College of Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Ave.
Boston, Mass. 02215
tel # 617-353-6421
fax # 617-353-4370
e-mail # jbarrett@bu.edu

Saturday - August 12,1995
1 pm to 2:30 pm

Paper accepted by Mass Communication and Society Division,
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
for presentation at the 1995 AEJMC Annual Conference in Washington, D.C.

Running head: Channel One study

CS509112

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study of Channel One, the 10 minutes of television news programs and 2 minutes of commercials in classrooms, describes the opinions and evaluative comments of participant teachers, librarians, admininistrators and students. The results are based on what they reported during individual interviews and focus groups over a 16 month period. Use of Channel One was observed in eight selected school sites (four in MA and four in FLA) where the participants watched Channel one. The findings focus on curriculum relevancy of Channel One programs, student/teacher opinions of Channel One, policy decisions regarding the Channel one contract, equity issues and equipment usage.

Student and Teacher Perspectives on Channel One : A Qualitative Study of Participants in Massachusetts and Florida Schools

The Controversy about Channel One

Over the course of the past four years, Channel One, the 10 minute news and 2 minute commercial program aimed at secondary school students and launched in 1989 by Whittle Communications, has become controversial, due to educators' concerns regarding the commercials. Objections to Channel One were raised by educators, state commissioners, teacher leaders, and parent groups . Educators' concerns center on whether or not the benefits for the schools justify the commercial marketing of Channel One to a captive audience of students. Critics such as Peggy Charren, President (now retired) of Action for Children's Television, former Dean Patricia Graham of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and former California Superintendent of Schools William Honig questioned whether or not the classroom is the appropriate environment for promoting commercial products. Educators' groups, such as the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Education Association, the National PTA, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, denounced schools' participation in Channel One, primarily because of the advertising component combined with flashy graphics and the reduction in instructional time. Some states banned Channel One (e.g., New York, California, Nevada, Rhode Island).There have been several lawsuits challenging the introduction of Channel One into schools (DeVaney et al, 1994, pp. 189-205).

Educators also focused their concerns on the ethical issue of delivering captive audiences of student consumers to advertisers, especially in

consideration of Channel One's substantial profits. After two years, the ad rates for the two minutes of paid commercials increased from $150,000 to $200,000 for a 30-second spot on Channel One. The Wall Street Journal estimated annual revenues of $100 million, with the profits generated from this venture amounting Channel One study to almost $2 million per week (Kornbluth, 1992). In September, 1994, Whittle Communications, the company that launched Channel One, agreed to sell $340 million worth of Channel One stock to KCIII Communications (Sharpe, 1994) because advertisers are interested in the direct access provided by Channel One into classrooms to reach the teenage market a means to build product loyalty "The 28 million teenagers in the U. S. spend $78 billion a year, $33 billion of which comes out of their own pockets. The other $45 billion is family money teenagers help to spend. Young people also develop brand and product loyalties that could last a life time — no small consideration for advertisers." (Rist, 1989, p.21).

Channel One provides access to teenagers with free equipment to the schools, air time for advertisers to reach their teenage market, and a fast-paced, colorful, entertaining current events news program for the students.

Some educators have expressed concerns that the 10 minute commercial news program broadcast daily on Channel One into classrooms does not provide an important learning experience for students. Critics such as Bill Honig stated , "Our students are not for sale.... We're afraid that this commercialism is going to corrupt the whole educational process." The Columbia Journalism Review characterized the MTV-style pacing and flashy graphics of Channel One as "the video-game approach to news" (Moore, 1989).

Literature on Channel One

The national debate on Channel One has been examined extensively in the mainstream media. Several hundred newspaper stories, editorials, columns and magazine articles about Channel One have been published since 1989, the year it was first proposed. Because it has existed in schools for only four years, a limited number of academic studies on Channel One have been completed. To date, the research completed so far on Channel One has focused on the program content and commercials. Researchers have investigated such topics as whether Channel One produces increased student knowledge of current events (Endres, 1991; Johnson & Brzezinski, 1991-94; Supovitz, 1991; Tiene, 1993).

Johnson & Brzezinski completed a three-year academic study, funded by a $900,000 grant from Whittle Communications, in 1994 at the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research. In total, 56 schools from 19 states participated in the study. The schools represented a wide range of communities - from rural to urban. The quantitative study conducted pre-testing and post-testing of students' knowledge of current events after a period of watching Channel One. This research also included a separate study of teachers' and administrators' opinions gathered from focus groups in 100 sample schools. Their results, published in July of 1994, stated that,

> ...its effect on the measured current events knowledge of the average viewer was quite small.... The groups that may be most in need of a broader world outlook may need more help than the broadcast itself can provide... as good as the technology may be, teachers must be prepared to help students assemble the somewhat fragmented knowledge that we know as the news... (Johnson, 1994).

On April 3, 1991, the results of an eight-month quantitative study titled "The Uses and Effects of Video News Programs in High Schools in Mississippi and North Carolina" were released by the Southeastern Educational Improvement

Laboratory at Duke University. This study, conducted primarily by John Supovitz, surveyed 3,000 high school students and 140 teachers in 51 schools in Mississippi and North Carolina in the fall of 1990. They conducted extensive pre-testing and post-testing of students over a six-month period of Channel One viewing. Other uses for the equipment were not mentioned. The findings stated, "Commercial video news programs, television news produced specifically for students, by themselves have no significant impact on student knowledge of current events" (Supovitz, 1991).

Some studies have analyzed the content of the advertising on Channel One (Greenberg & Brand, 1992; Mueller & Wulfmeyer 1991; Rist, 1991). For example, in their study analyzing the content of ads airing on Channel One, Mueller and Wulfemeyer (1991) conclude that the ads focused primarily on " leisure/pleasure, appearance/ sexuality..." They also discovered that most commercials featured a dominant character who was Caucasian 87% of the time, and male 57% of the time.

> Channel One commercials did not present an adequate racial mix of characters. African-American, Hispanic, or Asian characters were rarely visible. Even the commercials that featured a large cast, more than 75% had only Caucasian characters. Such racially disproportionate presentations seem inappropriate for schools with racially mixed student populations. (Mueller and Wulfmeyer 1991, p.148)

Another study suggests that the type of community may be related to the reasons why school districts subscribe to Channel One. There may be a relationship between SES and Channel One subscribing school districts. The University of Massachusetts Amherst (1993) released the results of a quantitative study of 17,344 public schools commissioned by UNPLUG, a youth organization working to involve young people in education. The findings indicate that public schools with the greatest concentration of low income students are more than

twice as likely (37.7% vs. 16.6%) as the schools with the wealthiest students to have Channel One. The data also show a strong relationship between the proportions of African-American students in a school and the likelihood that the school has Channel One. "The most glaring discrepancies revolve around clusters of attributes reflecting class, income and race. Channel One schools do not represent a typical cross-section of American schools. They differ in consistent, systematic and troubling ways from other schools" (Morgan, 1993). Finally, there have been some pieces published regarding opinions of Channel One (Carlin, 1992; DeVaney,1994; Ehman, 1991; Knupfer, 1993).

Purpose of this Study:

Because the critics' claims and proponents' arguments about Channel One may or may not have validity for students and teachers in schools participating in Channel One, the purpose of this study was to examine Channel One's use from the perspective of participants involved in viewing the program. The goal was to discover what teachers report they are teaching and students say they are learning from daily exposure to Channel One in their classrooms. The first task was to ask students if they are discerning differences between the advertising and the programming, and if they are thinking critically about the commercials and the news. A second task was to elicit students and teachers opinions of Channel One. These research purposes, goals and tasks were integrated in the following broad categories:

— curriculum integration and equipment use of Channel One in participating schools;

— teacher attitudes towards Channel One, positive and negative;

— student attitudes towards Channel One, positive and negative;

— policy decisions and school management of Channel One.

Methodology

In order to answer the research questions, I designed a qualitative study, gathering information through interviews with students, teachers and librarians about the use of Channel One in their schools. Over a sixteen month period, I spent extensive periods of time observing the use of Channel One in the eight schools. In addition to interviews and site visit observations, I collected documents about Channel One policy, procedures, contracts and equipment. Some of this information was from school department files kept by the librarians, teachers, principals and/or district superintendents. Also, I collected newspaper and magazine articles, state board policy statements, legal opinions, organization and association position papers on Channel One, and material distributed by Whittle Communications to participating school districts.

Sites

There are a total of eight schools in this study, four in Florida and four in Massachusetts:

- two middle schools in Florida
- two senior high schools in Florida
- one senior high school in Massachusetts (one of the original eight schools set up by Whittle as pilot schools in the U.S.)
- two middle school/senior high school sites housed in the same building (Massachusetts)
- one senior high school (Massachusetts)

Each of these schools was "on line" with Channel One for more than a year; each school is situated in a district which fits the profile of schools

targeted by Whittle and described by Morgan in his study: low- to lower middle income, working-class communities with an eroding tax base, who are having budget difficulties and are receptive to accepting the expensive equipment offered with the contract (Morgan,1993). There are two age groups of students, middle school and high school students, included in the study.

Through a written request to the principal of each school, permission for access to the schools to conduct this research was given. However, in one school, my movements were restricted to a room in the school library, where the librarian and principal brought students and teachers for interviews. Every respondent at that school site had uniformly positive comments about Channel One, so there are serious doubts about the validity of that data. Throughout this report, I note the discrepancies in controlled environments vs. those with free and unrestricted access. Also, my observation of Channel One's broadcast in that particular site was limited to viewing the library's monitor in the presence of the librarian and the principal with a small group of students selected by the principal.

Interviews

I conducted several one-on-one interviews at each site, ranging from 30 to 60 minutes, with every school's principal, librarian, a number of teachers for different subject areas, and a wide range of students, grades 7-12. Also, I conducted focus group interviews with students and teachers at each school. In total, there were 85 students, 42 teachers, 3 department heads, 8 principals, and 8 librarians who participated in this study. I spoke to 3 associate or assistant superintendents over the telephone to request responses to specific policy decisions regarding Channel One's use in their school districts.

All interviews were transcribed and coded according to the following categories:

- curriculum relevancy of Channel One
- the impact of commercial messages in classrooms
- the students' comments about their knowledge of current events and their opinions of Channel One
- teachers' attitudes about the program content, the ads, the benefits and the disadvantages of Channel One
- teachers' and librarians' reactions to the educational policy decisions and administrative procedures about Channel One

Site Observations/Field Notes

I visited eight schools with Channel One (four in Massachusetts and four in Florida) which included both middle schools and senior high schools where I observed students viewing Channel One in homerooms, libraries, cafeterias, and study halls. From the site observations, extensive, detailed field notes were coded according to categories such as the following examples:

- student behavior during Channel One commercials
- student behavior during Channel One news
- teacher behavior during Channel One broadcasts
- librarians' activities before, during and after Channel One broadcasts

Beginning with coded interview transcripts and coded field notes from site visits and observations, I created categories, made connections between categories, developed some theoretical frameworks out of the grounded data, then analyzed the conclusions within this context (Bogdan and Bilken,1982; Murphy, 1980; Patton, 1980; Yin, 1989).

Data Analysis and Validity

This qualitative study relied on triangulation of data for building the grounded theory and drawing conclusions. Cross-checking what participants said in interviews with what they did and I observed during the site visits was a crucial part of the validation process. (Bogdan and Bilken,1982; Murphy, 1980; Patton, 1980; Yin, 1989).

Summary of the Study's Findings

There are several findings related to the broad categories of curriculum, learning and educational policy described in the research questions. Also, a number of new issues emerged during the course of this study which were identified by the participants. As with any study results, there were striking similarities in the data (e.g., with the lack of curriculum use, the central role of the librarians, and placement of the program in the school day during homeroom), and differences of opinion, both positive and negative, about the commercials and news programs. A summary of this study's key findings follows, highlighted in brief statements under the major categories:

1.Curriculum integration and equipment use of Channel One in participating schools:

- No school visited has formally integrated the news programming on Channel One into its curriculum.
- There are scattered spontaneous efforts by a few teachers in social studies, business and foreign language to mention the content of that morning's Channel One new broadcast, if it is germane to the class discussion.
- There is no extensive, creative use of the equipment in the curriculum beyond the broadcast of Channel One, other than

school-wide daily announcements and occasional videotape viewing in some classes.

- No teachers had developed "mini-units" on persuasive language, advertising techniques, or propaganda to integrate into their courses to help students think critically about the ads on Channel One.

The lack of integration may be due to a number of reasons, the most obvious being the lack of interest on the part of teachers to create "mini-units" or class discussions or writing assignments based on Channel One's programs. The reasons for their lack of motivation to create curriculum initiatives around the program vary according to the subject matter they teach, the teacher's autonomy in the classroom, the lack of time to introduce new material, the lack of administrative leadership to encourage this, the teachers' attitudes towards Channel One, and the students' behavior during the broadcast. For example, regarding subject matter they teach as being inappropriate for Channel One, a senior high school English teacher in Florida stated:

> We don't use it because it doesn't fit our curriculum at all. We're American Literature teachers, barely getting out of the Puritan period. So we can't use it. I guess we could use it for writing assignments sometimes, but usually we have the writing assignments programmed into the literature as well.

A secondary school social studies teacher in Florida spoke about the issue of teacher autonomy related to curricular initiatives:

> I would never use Channel One as part of my classroom, because I would not want to be dictated by Channel One as to what I will or will not discuss in my room. If the kids want to talk about it, then fine. But in no way would I say this is our lesson for the day.

One Massachusetts principal made it clear that Channel One is

Channel One study

> ...not an integral part of the curriculum because it is just the news program in the morning. I'm not sure that many teachers will tell you that they have integrated it into the curriculum and I wouldn't push them to do it, either.

A middle school social studies teacher in Florida described Channel One's role in her classroom as:

> We don't use it as a teaching tool, we just use it as an information-getting kind of instrument. We do talk about, informally, talk about what they see. That's how we use it in this classroom.

Another social studies teacher, this one in a Massachusetts high school, explained the most common use of Channel One as a sporadic reference point used during class discussions occasionally:

> Well, as far as the news, I don't think I usually mention something because it's been on Channel One; if it's been in the news I might mention it and refer to the fact that it was mentioned in Channel One. Let's see. Occasionally, I will refer, when I'm talking to a class, spontaneously when I'm talking to a class, I might think of something that I saw mentioned on Channel One and make reference to it, to try and make a connection with the kids that I've seen it and then we can connect with some point that I want to make, in general, to something in the classroom. I don't use it as part of the curriculum. It doesn't really fit it a great deal.

Here's a verbatim exchange from a transcript of an interview with a high school foreign language teacher in Massachusetts:

> Q: Do you feel that Channel One is an integral part of your curriculum?
>
> A: No, not at all.
>
> Q: Why not?
>
> A: I don't think it has become an integral part yet, and I don't think it ever will. For most teachers all that is being used is the morning broadcast, and that's just the 12 minutes plus the commercials.

Students, in their interviews, confirmed that Channel One's news broadcasts were not part of their classes or coursework. These comments are from both middle school and high school students in Florida and Massachusetts:

Channel One study

The teachers don't usually mention it [Channel One] to our classes.

Most of the teachers, I don't really see that in any other of my classes, that they ever do really work it into the curriculum, but I don't know. But I mean, I really don't see it worked into our studies or whatever.

They don't even bring up Channel One in our classes.

Occasionally we'll discuss later on in one of my other debate classes something that was on. But basically, no, not as any kind of a regular thing.

All we do is watch Channel One and after that...the teacher doesn't really talk about it. We just go home and watch more news, I guess.

Once in a while a teacher might refer to something on Channel One, but not very often. It we ever talk about it, it's usually at lunch or something with the other kids.

During my observations in all eight schools, I found only limited use of the equipment beyond broadcasting Channel One. For example, in one school in Florida and one school in Massachusetts, the students read the daily school-wide announcements over the air, just prior to broadcast of Channel One. In a few cases, they used the equipment to simultaneously broadcast movies or videotapes to all the classes in a particular subject area, such as a Shakespeare movie to English classes. When asked how else this equipment was being used, the respondents made statements such as:

During the Christmas holidays, we broadcast Christmas music on one channel, it was coming out of the media cable system. — Librarian, Massachusetts high school

We can also use the equipment to broadcast things from the building. We've done that only on two occasions. One was when we were running something from the graphic arts department, to interest students in graphic arts, and they had a video that they wanted students to see to encourage 7th graders to look into courses. So one morning, in place of Channel One, we ran that. — Principal, Florida middle school

However, some participants described potential ways the equipment could be used. "One of the things that is so exciting is the potential uses of this technology," stated a Massachusetts principal. He described a potential scenario:

> Something the superintendent would like to do is tie in the computer system so that we can make announcements, and things of that nature, that could be shown as well. With this program, we could do a live broadcast with your Camcorder or whatever, and principal or whatever could be speaking with the students throughout the school.

This is a managerial, administrative use of the equipment, not a use for teaching purposes. When asked about the advantages to having the equipment (which several principals and teachers cited as one of the most important benefits of having Channel One), several of them referred to the convenience and availability of the equipment. One middle school English teacher in Massachusetts summarized it as such:

> It's much easier to go and get a VCR and bring it into the room than it is to get a TV and VCR and have to wheel it in. It's more...it makes it easier. It's nice having a TV in every room, readily available. I don't think that I use the TV any more, but it's just easier to do it.

A Massachusetts principal said:

> Now we have the VCRs at our use, and it's easier for our teachers to show VCR programs now.

A Florida librarian echoed this convenience factor with her comment:

> Any time a teacher is going to show a video, the one in my office is free, they would prefer not to have to do it themselves. It's just easier to give me the tape. It's more convenient...rather than wheeling the VCR down the hall.

Another Florida librarian pointed out two other uses they have had for the Channel One equipment. When I asked if they have used the equipment for any other purposes other than Channel One broadcasts, Mrs. R. mentioned (1) a

school-produced video about their elective courses broadcast to the student body during the course selection period, and (2) some Spanish foreign language classes viewed videos from the Learning Channel. "That's all that's been done so far," she said. When asked it there were any other plans to expand use of the equipment, she stated, "Not that I know of."

In summary, I did not find any examples of Channel One being integrated into the curriculum or formally into class discussions, projects, readings, or writing assignments. There is only limited use of the equipment for instructional purposes outside of the school's broadcast of Channel One.

2. Teacher attitudes toward Channel One: positive and negative

- Teacher reactions to Channel One seem to vary by the subject matter they teach, the level of students they teach, and by their duties and responsibilities during the school day, particularly during homeroom..
- Some teachers identified benefits to Channel One, e.g., "their maps are useful for kids," "it calms the kids down at the start of the day," "it sparks an interest in current events for students."
- Several teachers described Channel One as "an intrusion," "the commercialization of our kids in school," whereas other teachers made comments such as, "The commercials don't bother me because they're no different than what kids see at home."
- There seems to be a "turn on, watch, then turn off" procedure for teachers regarding Channel One, incorporating only minimal discussion with students encouraging them to think critically about either the news or ads they're exposed to every morning for 12 minutes. One teacher pinpointed this problem when she stated,

"It's a good babysitting service. It keeps the kids quiet and settled them down, thank God."

- For teachers, the decision-making process of how Channel One came into their school seems to have an impact on their attitudes towards it (negative if they didn't have input or feel they didn't have input about the decision).

An analysis of interview transcripts indicates that teachers identified the benefits of Channel One as:

- the equipment
- students' increased awareness of geography and current events
- the pop quizzes.

Several teachers felt very positive about these issues, as their comments indicate:

About the equipment:

> I think the biggest obvious benefit was to get $100,000-worth of equipment into our school system that we could not in any way have afforded any other way. — English teacher, Florida high school

> I think we've been having budget problems, but I don't think we have been hit by other groups. I think the equipment that Channel One set up was definitely a plus, otherwise they wouldn't have offered it. They rolled it out, and we took it. — English teacher, Massachusetts high school

> For us, that was a major benefit, to get audio-visual equipment. — Librarian, Massachusetts high school

Many of the teachers, however, didn't know that Whittle will remove the equipment if the school doesn't renew its 3-year contract (as stated in the contract, a document I collected from the school districts). What baffled me is why these schools justified their contract with Channel One on the basis of the

$50,000 worth of equipment provided and then not use it in creative, productive ways to help with the teaching and learning process.

About students' increased awareness of geography and current events:

> One of the best parts of the graphics is the geography. They not only show you where the country is that they are talking about, but they show you enough of the surrounding area for you to put it into perspective. From a geography standpoint, their graphics can't be beat. —Librarian, Massachusetts middle school

> Well, for some students who don't know geography that well, they can see on the screen in bright colors exactly where a country or city is. The geographic visuals, the maps are helpful to kids. The names of people and places look real clear, reinforcing what the students see on the map. Channel One prints out the names and explains their meaning and location. Also, when the Berlin Wall came down, Channel One did a lot on Germany. —Social studies teacher, Florida middle school

About the daily pop quizzes on current events:

> They love those pop quizzes. They think that's fine. I think it's good for them because they will watch the news. —English teacher, Florida high school

> My homeroom kids happen to like the pop quiz a lot, and we do talk about that in homeroom in class and say, "Who knows the answer to that?" That's the only thing the kids are aware of, at least in my homeroom. — Foreign language teacher, Massachusetts high school

The teachers interviewed criticized Channel One in a number of areas, particularly concerning the commercials, the superficial approach to news and the instructional time or school day additional time taken away from the classroom learning experience. Some sample quotes from teachers on these concerns are as follows:

On the commercials:

> Well, their main thrust as a company is that they want to make profit through advertisement, and the more schools they have sign up,

the more money they have. —Social studies teacher, Massachusetts middle school

For the amount of money they're getting from the sponsors, they could be doing a better job. I've seen much better PBS shows than what they're doing here. It's too sickening sweet and played down a little. [Concerning the commercials, I think] they're stupid. I don't like them. I don't think they're appropriate, most of the time. — Science teacher, Massachusetts high school

On Channel One's superficial approach to news:

On the whole, though, the news information is pretty juvenile, superficial and slick. — Social studies teacher, Massachusetts middle school

I think the time frame is too short to cover anything in any depth. But I have kids who are interested in politics and are interested in current events. They've complained that it's too superficial, especially my advanced class. — Social studies teacher, Massachusetts high school

On the time taken during the school day for Channel One:

It takes up a lot of time in the schedule and also, the kids aren't paying attention to it, for the most past, and why have something that the kids aren't really paying attention to. — English teacher, Florida high school

They're not watching, there is just 12 minutes in the morning that is just dead time. —Social studies teacher, Massachusetts high school

In summary, none of the teachers were completely critical in their comments; neither were any of them completely positive. Most recognized the complexities of the controversial issues surrounding Channel One. Many of the teachers treated it as background noise. For example, included here is a descriptive write-up of student and teacher behavior from my field notes during an observation at a Massachusetts high school.

In observing the students this morning watching Channel One, there were 17 students, all juniors, only 3 or 4 of them were attentive to the program The rest of them were clustered about in groups of 2 or 3 or 4, laughing and talking and looking at each

> other, not looking at the programs or the commercials. Several times the teacher went around the room and urged them to be quiet, and they basically didn't pay much attention to her. Then she came over to me and said, "Oh, the students were acting up in this class today, probably because you are here and I am distracted talking to you." As I walked through the building, I didn't see any classrooms during the homeroom period where the students were completely attentive to watching Channel One. As I observed student behavior during the Channel One broadcast, most students appeared to be distracted, either talking to each other or studying or reading. The teachers I observed were either talking to students or walking around the room or sitting at their desks correcting papers.

This scenario was repeated several times during my observations and site visits, except at one site, where I watched Channel One in a designated room in the library, with 5 or 6 selected students, the librarian and the principal.

3. Students' attitudes towards Channel One:

- During their viewing of Channel One, with very few exceptions (small groups in the library, for example), students treated it as "background noise," as they talked to each other, moved about the room or interacted with their homeroom teacher. Occasionally, they would react to the "pop quizzes".
- Nearly all high school students categorized Channel One's news as more appropriate for younger students of middle-school age; they complained about "superficial" and "simplistic" coverage.
- Many students called the commercials "boring," "dumb," "stupid," yet they could describe them in detail. Some students admitted to becoming hungry during candy commercials.
- Several students indicated they were learning more about geography and current events since they began viewing Channel One, especially since the Gulf war.

- Many students stated that they couldn't see any difference between the TV news they watched at home and what they saw on Channel One in school.
- A few students admitted to reading their local area newspapers more; the vast majority claimed no differences in their reading or viewing habits. For example, when asked, none reported reading newspapers of the caliber of *The New York Times.*
- Nearly all students explained why Channel One had commercials as, "That's how they pay for it." None of them perceived themselves as the target audience for the advertisers.
- When asked how they would improve Channel One, most students made comments like, "Can the commercials."

In many respects, students concurred in their comments with teachers regarding Channel One, by confirming they liked the pop quizzes; they are learning about geography and current events ; they hate the commercials, and some of them resent having to watch them. High school students feel it's better for middle schools. Because student interviews were the largest number of transcripts, what follows are representative comments that capture the perspectives of students in the broadest categories. Their language was more blunt and direct than that of the teachers, librarians and principals. I was the first adult educator to interview them about Channel One, so many of them had extensive comments. Most student interviews lasted a full class period, during their study hall time in the library or cafeteria.

Overall student comments on Channel One:

> The good part is it keeps us up on current events, and the bad part is the commercials and some of their little questions that no one would know, like pop quizzes. — Massachusetts sophomore

I feel that education in schools should be commercial free, because there's really no need to get school commercialized, because there is enough things in school that are commercialized...there's no need. — Massachusetts junior

The only benefits are to the people who put out the commercials, they're making more money. — Massachusetts senior

I understand they have to pay for their commercials and all, that's how they get their money for the program, and I feel that the commercials they've chosen are pretty much adequate, they relate to the teenagers, you know, and high school students, so I feel that there's nothing wrong with the commercials themselves. — Massachusetts senior

The benefits are that you're actually learning something about what's going on in the world. The disadvantages are they only give you the top part; they don't exactly tell you why or how come. They just tell you what's happening, not why it's happening. — Florida junior

I think they have too many message commercials — the Burger King, the stay in school one. We see enough of that kind of stuff on TV regularly. It's too much. — Florida sophomore

Well, Channel One is a pretty good experience for those who don't get home very early in the afternoon, can't catch the 5:30 or 6:00 news. It's a refreshment, it's like stepping in the shower, it's refreshing, —Massachusetts junior

I don't really watch it because people are talking too loud, even our teachers are talking, so the only time I really watch it is when they're talking about the Middle East and what's going on right now, and then I yell at everybody to shut up. Basically, I don't watch it because I really can't hear anything, with everybody talking. — Massachusetts sophomore

On geography and the pop quizzes:

I like the quizzes. We usually just sit there, but when the quiz comes on, everyone yells out an answer. When they give the correct answer the kids get excited if they got the right answer. My whole class usually watches, but today we didn't. But usually we all watch. — Florida sophomore

I really think that Channel One points out the geographical locations and then lights up; I think that kind of helps us with our geography

Channel One study

because some people don't know their geography. — Massachusetts sophomore

Criticism of Channei One from **students** fell into two categories: the **commercials and the appropriateness of the news program for middle school students.** They nearly all said "cancel the commercials," "can the commercials," which they called "boring," "stupid," "terrible"; *yet,* several students admitted to becoming hungry during the food commercials and even singing along with the lyrics.

> In my class, the stupid M&M commercial, that none of us can stand, we mimic it with M&Ms and people try to throw it up and they realize that the little kid has it in his hands...we make fun of that every time we see it. — Massachusetts sophomore

> We usually ignore the commercials because they're boring, and we've seen them all before because they always play the same ones usually. — Massachusetts sophomore

> Channel One is only informative to lazy people who do not watch the news and have no choice to watch the news and watch it at school where they are forced to watch Channel One. — Massachusetts senior

> If they're going to promote news in school, they should just tell you to watch it at home. That way you can decide whether to watch commercials or not. You shouldn't have to be put through it at school, there's enough of that crap around. — Massachusetts senior

One Massachusetts senior captured the feelings of many high school students about the **appropriate age level** for Channel One viewing:

> I think the concept is a good idea, but I don't think it goes as deep as it should, because we're seniors, and 6th and 7th and 8th graders are also seeing this, and were getting the same information, and most of the information we see has been on the night before or the day before. I can understand that because we don't have time. It's things we know, it's just not at the level it should be for high school students, it's more at a middle-school level where it seems to work very well. So, if the kids aren't interested and they're not watching it, and the teachers have no control in the classroom while we're watching it, and the

> commercials are the same things over and over again, I just don't think it's doing that well in high school.

Another senior, this one in Florida, agreed:

> Little kids, yeah. They act like we're little kids. They like spell out the words. They overexplain stupid, trivial things that nobody really cares about. They treat us like we're four and don't know anything. Sure there's kids in our school that don't, but it gets really boring. It's really oversimplified.

However, several **middle school students liked** the approach of Channel One with their **graphics, maps, vivid colors and detailed explanations**. For example, here are a few of their comments from middle school students in both Florida and Massachusetts.

> I like it because it is neat to have someone near your own age giving the news to you in their words you can understand, because in the other news programs they just say all these words and you'd better have a dictionary handy or something to look it up; by the time you look it up, you miss what was said next.

> It gives you more of a feeling that you can understand it. You get home and your parents are always talking about it, and they'll be home watching the news and you're in the room studying so you don't get to see it. On Channel One, you understand it and you get to hear it first, before anybody else. It's pretty cool.

> I like it because it makes you understand it more, instead of on the news when they talk so fast you can't catch what they're saying. But on Channel One, they explain it more.

Finally, several students complained about the **superficiality of the news programming.**

> Usually Channel One doesn't tell me anything I didn't already know, so it doesn't really matter. It doesn't make me want to go and find out more about it, because it doesn't go really deep into what's happening; it just skims the surface. — Florida junior

> I don't think it's changed my viewing habits or whatever. They usually show stuff that you usually don't see on the news, so it really hasn't changed me. — Massachusetts junior

One student even used Channel One as an excuse not to read the newspapers anymore:

> I don't get home in time to watch the news, but I like Channel One when I see it in the morning. I used to read the newspaper every morning, but I don't read it anymore. — Massachusetts senior

4. Policy decisions/school management of Channel One:

- In every school visited, Channel One was broadcast during the homeroom period, which was extended in each school to accommodate the additional 12 minutes needed. This structure meant that viewing Channel One is separated from the periods in which subject matter is taught (e.g., English classes, social studies classes). The only obligation the homeroom teacher has is to supervise students during the broadcast.
- The librarian in each school controls the classroom monitors with a master switch that turns Channel One on and off simultaneously throughout the entire building, whiich could affect the autonomy of teachers regarding their choices for classroom activities.
- The decision to have Channel One in all the schools visited (except one) was made without teacher input. In all schools (except one) visited, the faculty were told after the fact that Channel One would begin broadcasting into their classrooms every day. As a result, it was not surprising that several teachers characterized it as "an intrusion" into their school day, and they expressed some resentment and criticism of the process.
- Also, many teachers expressed feelings of powerlessness and passivity about their lack of input regarding their school district's

decision to contract with Channel One. They complained about the decisions being made by central office personnel, with little or no regard for the teachers' opinions about Channel One's use in their school.

One of the most significant issues regarding Channel One revolves around the questions of how the program came into the school and which school districts were most receptive to Whittle's sales pitch. Officials in both Florida and Massachusetts state education commissioner's offices alerted me to the question of equity. They described the school districts contracted with Channel One as being poorer, outlying, low- to lower middle-income areas. For example, wealthy school districts like Palm Beach, Florida and Wellesley, Massachusetts refused to deal with Channel One and signed on with other ad-free services, CNN Newsroom and the Christian Science Monitor cable news respectively.

What impact does the advertising then have on the poorer, younger people targeted? One child psychologist warned about this problem:

> Let's not forget that there are a lot of kids who really can't afford the things being advertised. Knowing the way teens and pre-teens operate, before you know it they'll be saying, "Gee, look at my jeans. They're the same ones we saw on TV." Of course, that's the goal of this presentation, but do we really want to subject our children to this?
> — Lee Salk, child psychologist, Cornell University Medical College, New York

One of the students recognized this problem when he said:

> I think the commercials aren't really based to us. I think the market is based towards us, but we really can't buy this stuff at school, and some of us don't have jobs, and so we can't buy it.

In visiting the communities where the schools in this study were located, it was evident from observations while driving through the towns and observing the

houses that these communities were low-income areas. During the interviews, the principals and teachers responded to my requests to describe the communities where their students resided. From a Massachusetts principal:

> This is a small mill town, I would say, middle to low income. Small town, it's a regional district made up of three towns pretty much lower socioeconomic income group. I don't know the percentage going to college, but most of our students go to two-year colleges. Our student body right now is running 1,420. It's mixed, most by far is white, lower middle class, strong blue-collar component, about 50% of the kids go on to school, either two- or four-year colleges, a lot to the community college and state colleges. We're not a wealthy community. A lot of the parents work at one of the paper mills. Some people are associated with the university, might be professional positions, might be secretarial or maintenance positions, but a lot of people do commute down there. But it's a factory community. This is a community that has a lot of demographic changes. We're beginning to have a lot of ethnic groups moving in, and I think our median income is going down, as far as the community is concerned. So, we're going to be wrestling with those changes.

From a librarian in Florida, who described the community her school serves:

> Here, near the mid-state, we are more depressed...in an entirely different situation...we are long behind in education because we don't have the money. Our students are deprived; we're behind in our educational systems; we have a large population of ethnic and whites on welfare and lots of people just surviving with farming. The construction and real estate industries are going under; the banks in Florida are experiencing troubles; we're just beginning to feel the effects of the recession state-wide, but it's pretty severe here...a lot of students have parents who've lost their jobs recently.

Quite simply, the inequities in education funding between poor districts and wealthy communities translated into the poorer districts, because of budget constraints and a lower property tax base, being more receptive to signing on with Channel One. They accepted an advertising campaign targeted to their young people in exchange for the $50,000 worth of equipment. But, at this point in the research process, I was still not clear on why schools justified their contract with Channel One using the equipment argument if (a) the equipment wasn't

being used much beyond daily broadcast of Channel One, or (b) the equipment is removed after three years if the school district doesn't renew their contract.

These concerns led me to explore a new area of questioning not intended in the original research question: **How and why did Channel One come into the schools in the first place?** Only in one school did I discover evidence of faculty input in the decision-making process. In all other schools, the decision was made at the superintendent's level:

> It doesn't make one whit of difference what the faculty thinks. We're bound by that contract with Whittle. We have to make certain that 90% (at least) of our kids watch it every day. As long as this machinery and equipment is plugged in, we can't avoid using it under the directive from the county superintendent's office to watch it every day. They [Whittle] bribed us with the equipment. We have no choice the way the equipment is set up. But, most teachers are resigned to it because they figure we'll do this Channel One for three years, then we'll drop Channel One, but we can keep the equipment. —English teacher, Florida senior high school

In Florida, superintendents of schools, like sheriffs, are elected every two years rather than selected and appointed by a school committee. A Florida librarian described the process to adopt Channel One as follows:

> It was a county decision for all the schools, made at the superintendent and school board level. There was no vote, no consensus, no discussion with the teachers here. When we raised objections to Channel One after it began broadcasting, the principal — she's a former social studies teacher, so she understands how faculty members think and feel — she formed a Channel One committee here at M. C. High School and, after they presented their report, we voted. The vote was 2 to 1 against Channel One, so you can see that the majority of teachers were definitely not in favor of Channel One.

She spoke about the role of the associate superintendent in the process.

> He pushed to get it into our school, he promoted it, he and the superintendent sold it to the voters in this district as a boon because of all the equipment we'd get...you know, the satellite dish,

> Channel One study the monitors, the cable wiring, etc. The voters were happy that they got "something for nothing," but it really wasn't that. We gave them our kids. The greatest benefit for the school district was the equipment. The biggest drawback, the most glaring negative with it [Channel One] is the question of the commercials, the fact that our kids have to watch the advertising.

When I asked a Massachusetts librarian about the process for bringing in Channel One, she pointed to a political reason why the superintendent in her school district was so eager to sign up with Channel One:

> By joining up in a corporate partnership between the schools and Channel One, they're trying to set a precedent. If it's a success, then other schools and corporations will want to get on the bandwagon, to get into classrooms, to reach the kids and build what they call "product loyalty." In the process, the superintendent and his staff get good PR and the company captures a young market.

In these days of school-based management, how do administrators expect a program to be successful if it's imposed "top down" from the district level, not the school level? Several teachers said that when they showed up at school in the fall, there was Channel One, broadcasting over the monitors that had been installed in their classrooms over the summer.

Findings in these areas during the research raised some questions for further study:

1. **Equity issues:** Why did only certain types of school districts sign the contract with Channel One, (in each case, they have been low-income, lower middle-class or working-class communities), and what implications does this have for poor students?

2. **Legal issues:** Do adults in school districts who are responsible for minor children have the right to sell the time and the access to those children to commercial vendors for the school district's equipment?

3. **Responsibility of educators:** In defending the use of Channel One in schools, some administrators, at least one librarian, and a few teachers described it as "enrichment," "encouraging media literacy," and/or "stimulating student interest in current events." Then, why don't they have any assessment and/or evaluation procedures in place to provide empirical evidence for their claims? Also, why isn't it more closely tied to teaching and learning within the formal structure of the school?

4. **Ethical issues:** Who stands to benefit from Channel One if teachers and students don't see educational value in its use?

5. **Use of the Equipment:** Why justify Channel One on the basis of equipment availability and then not make more productive use of the equipment?

Conclusion

This study indicates that the benefits of Channel One appear to be student-heightened interest in geography, current events and pop quizzes. It appears to be most appropriate for middle school students. The disadvantages of Channel One, according to students and teachers, are the commercials, the superficial programming, the intrusion into the school day, the lack of integration into the curriculum, the lack of inclusion of teachers in the policy decision to contract with Channel One, and the superficial television emphasis on visuals, graphics and motion.

Recommendations

Educational policymakers need to analyze carefully the limited benefits of Channel One against the backdrop of the numerous disadvantages prior to signing a contract with Channel One If, however, the school district's leaders did

want to introduce Channel One into their schools, I would make the following recommendations:

1. Involve teachers in the decision-making process regarding Channel One.

2. Target a middle-school audience for the programming.

3. Encourage teachers (especially in English and social studies) to develop curriculum units for critical viewing and thinking of TV news programs and commercials.

4. If the main rationale is the equipment Channel One.provides, then the administrators should ensure that the equipment is used more extensively and creatively.

5. The school district's leadership should develop assessment and evaluation procedures for Channel One's use and its effectiveness.

However, because there are other commercial-free TV video news services available to schools, I would encourage administrators to look at all options, not just Channel One, as they decide to use TV in their classrooms.

References

Action for Children's Television n.d. Classroom News and Commercials in the Classroom. Cambridge, MA: Action for Children's Television.

Adams, S. (October 31- November 3, 1991). "Whittle Communications and Channel One: Rhetorical Strategies of Innovation," Atlanta, GA. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association.

Apple, M., (1992). "Constructing the Captive Audience: Channel One and the Political Economy of the Text," International Studies in Sociology of Education, vol.2, no.2, pp.107-31.

Associated Press (October 20, 1993). "Study finds More Poor Schools than Wealthy Using Channel One," Boston Globe, p. 25.

Barlow, D. (January, l993) . "Channel One Counterpoint," Education Digest, 58, no.5, p. 15.

Barlow, D., (October l992). "Channel One Update," Education Digest, 58, no.2, p. 26-28.

Berry, G.L. & Asamen, J.K. (1993). Children and Television: Images in a Changing Sociocultural World. London.: Sage International.

Bogdan, R. and S.K. Biklen (l982) Qualitative Research for Education and Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brock, P. (September 21, l992). " Christopher Whittle: The Man Who Wants to Teach Your Children Well - and for a Profit," People, 38, no. l2, p.123-125.

Carlin, T. and others (l992). "The perception of the Educational Value of Channel One among Secondary Level Teachers and Students," Paper presented at the Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

California Department of Education (August 4,1989). "Honig Explains Why Channel One is Barred from California Schools," News Release. Sacremento, CA.

Celano, D. and Neuman, S. (February, 1995). "Channel One: The Delimma of Teaching and Selling," Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 76, no. 6, pp. 444 - 446

Children's Television Act of 1990. Public Law 101-437. October 18, 1990.

Chira, S. (April 23, l992). "Little Help from School TV Show -Study of Channel One," The New York Times, P. A8.

Conant, Jennet. (December 1994). "The Whittle of Oz," Vanity Fair,vol. 57, no. 12, p. 205-247.

Congress of the United States, (July 26, 1991). Hearing before the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. "Channel One: Educational Television and Technology," Washington, D.C., U. S. Government Printing Office.

Dao, J. (May l9,l993). "Channel One, Round Two: New Push to Bring TV to NY Schools," The New York Times, p.B1 and B4.

Dao, J. (June 26, l993). "New York Regents Reaffirm Ban on TV Program in Classrooms." The New York Times, p.l6 and p. 21.

DeFleur,M. et al (Winter, 1992). "Audience Recall of News Stories Presented by Newspaper, Computer, Television and Radio," Journalism Quarterly, vol.69, no.4, PP.1010-1022.

De Vaney, A., ed., (1994). Watching Channel One : The Convergence of Students, Technology, and Private Business. Albany, New York. State University of New York Press.

Donaton, S. (May l8, l992). "More Turbulence for Channel One," Advertising Age, vol. 63, no. 20, p.48.

Donaton, S. (March 25, l994). "Whittle Eyes Mired Empire, "Advertising Age, p.2.

Ehman, L. (November 22, l991). "Using Channel One in Social Studies Classrooms: A First Look, " Washington, D.C., Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Social Studies.

Ellsworth, E. and Whatley, M.H. (1990). The Ideology of Images in Educational Media: Hidden Curriculums in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Elson, J. (August l5, l994). "Whittling Down", Time magazine, p.31.

Endres, K., Endres F., and Miles, T. (August l991). "Whittle's Channel One and CNN'S Newsroom: A Systematic Pilot Study of Teen Oriented News Content," Boston, Ma. Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Fabrikant, G. (July 30, l993). "Whittle Said to Scale Back its For-Profit Ventures," The New York Times, p.c1 and p.dl.

Fitzgerald, M. (May l8, l992). "Classroom TV Has Negligible Effect: Study Examines Whittle," Editor and Publisher, 125, no.20, p.20-22.

Folkemer, P. and Hobbs,R. (January 26, 1994). "Refocusing the Channel One Debate", Education Week, vol.XIII, no. 18, p. 11.

Friedman, J. (February l7, 1992). "Big Business Goes to School,: The Nation, 254, no.6, p. 188-192.

Gelston, S. (September 21, 1993). "Targeting Kids Cash Clout: Business Sees Hot Market in School Kids," Boston Herald, p. 29 and p.35.

Gillim, L. (September/ October 1994) "Lessons from Channel One: It's the Teacher, Not the Television, That Matters." Harvard Education Letter X, no. 5 : 7-8.

Graves, B. (March 1990). "Classrooms Tune In," School Administrator, 47, no.3, p.8-11, and p. 14-18.

Greenberg, B. (December-January, 1993-94). "Channel One: But What About the Advertising?" Educational Leadership, vol.51, no.4, pp.56-58.

Greenberg, B. and Brand, J. (Winter 1993) " Television News and Advertising in Schools: The Channel One Controversy." Journal of Communication 43, no.1 : 143-151.

Haney, J.M. (November 18-21,1989). " TV 101: Good Broadcast Journalism for the Classroom? " Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, CA, November. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 750).

Hoffman, L.M. (April 3-7,1991). " The Meanings of Channel One: Curriculum, Instruction, and Ethics; History, Control, and Rhetoric."Chicago, Ill. Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Howe, M. (Ed.). Learning from television. London: Academic, 1983.

Johnson, J. and Brzezinski, E (1994). Channel One: A Three Year Perspective. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, U. of Michigan, ; 313-763-5325.

Johnston, J. (February, 1995). "Channel One: The Delimma of Teaching and Selling," Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 76, no. 6, pp. 436 - 443.

Kleinfield, N (May l9, 1991). "What is Chris Whittle Teaching Our Children?" The New York Times Magazine, p. 32-33.

Konrad, W. (January 27, 1992). "How Good is Attendance in Chris Whittle's Class? Channel One TV - Satellite Broadcast to Schools, " Business Week, no. 3249, P.103.

Kozol, J. (September 21,1992). "Whittle and The Privateers: Corporate Raid on Education, " The Nation, vol. 255, no.8, p. 272-277.

Knupfer, N. et al (February 5-9, 1992). "The Significance of the Channel One Experiment: Report on the First Year." Washington, D.C., Paper presented at the Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

Knupfer, N. (January 13-17,1993). "Channel One: Reactions of Students, Teachers and Parents." New Orleans, LA.Paper presented at the Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

Kuby, R. (December 30, 1993). "Whittling The School Day Away", MTA Today, p.8 and 9.
"

Laird N.RR. (1978). Which Media do Teachers Use Most?" Audiovisual Instruction, vol.23(6), pp.23-25.
Lesser, G.S. (September 15, 1987). The Commercialization of Children's Television. Washington, D.C.: House of Representatives.

Lesser, G.S. (November 15, 1989). Television and Reading: Can They still be Friends? Washington, D.C. Library of Congress.

Library of Congress. (1993). Selected legislation in the 103rd congress related to electronic information delivery. Compiled by Allene Farmer Hayes, Congressional Services Team. pp. 1-15.

Liebermand, D. (August 11, 1994). "Whittling a Media Empire", USA Today, p. B1 and B2.

Light, R., Singer, J. and Willett, J. (1990). By Design Planning Research on Higher Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Locke, L. (May, 1993). "Bergeson Confirmation May Open Door for Channel One, " California Journal, 24, no.5, p.3.

Martin, K. (May 1992). "Controversy Over Channel One Continues: Program Fails to Pass Muster in Missouri," St. Louis Journalism Review, 22, no. 146, p. 5-6.

Martin, T. (March 21, 1993). "Billerica Students Learn to Question TV," Boston Globe, P.42 and p. 44.

Matthews, D. et al. (1993). "Whittle's Channel One: Powerful Effects for Politically Interested High School Seniors." Gainsville: College of Journalism And Communications, U. of Florida.

McNichol, T. (September l8-20, 1992). " Chris Whittle's Big Test: Can He Save Our Schools?" USA Weekend, p.4-6.

Mercer, Joyce (November 23, 1994). " Chris Whittle Keeps a Promise: Embattled Entepreneur Vows to Continue Scholarship Program at U. of Tenn.," Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A31-32.

Miller, C. (August 17, 1992). "Teachers Fight Channel One; Two Advertisers Drop Out," Marketing News, 26, no. 17, p. 1-2.

Morgan, M. (October 13, 1993)."Channel One in the Public Schools: Widening the Gaps," Amherst, MA Department of Communications, U. of MA.

Mueller, B. et al (August 5-8, 1992). "Commercial Speech and Captive Minds: Regulating Advertising in Public High Schools" Montreal, Quebec, Canada, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Murphy, J. (l980). Getting the Facts: A Fieldwork Guide for Evaluators and Policy Analysts. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.

Nealon, P. (April 12, 1993). "Channel One Runs its Course Amid Criticism," Boston Globe, p.13 and p. 16.

Patton, M.Q. (l980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Powers, J. (December 6, 1992). "P is for Profit: The Entrepreneurial Educator," The Boston Globe Magazine, p.14-15, p. 22-28 and p.31-35.

Rank, H. (December-January, 1993-94) "Channel One: Asking the Wrong Questions," Educational Leadership, vol. 51, no.4 pp.52-55.

Rank, H. (April 1992). "Channel One: Misconceptions Three," English Journal, 81 no.4, p. 31-32.

Reynolds, B. (June 12, 1991). "Can Chris Whittle Change Schools? " USA Today, p.A11.

Rist, M.C. (1989). Mass Marketers Have a Sweet Deal for You, but There Are Strings Attached. American School Board Journal, 176 (9), 20-24.

Rudinow, J. (1989-90, December-January). "Channel One Whittles Away at Education," Educational Leadership, 47(4) pp. 70-73.

Sharpe, A. (September 22, 1994). "Little of Whittle Remains After Sale," Wall Street Journal, p.B5.

Sirotnik K.A. (1986). What You See is What You Get: A Survey of Observations in Over 1000 Elementary and Secondary Classrooms, a study of schooling in the United States, Technical Report Series, No. 29. Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

Skelly, M (August 1991). "Classroom Television: Should Schools Tune In?" School and College, vol, 30, no. 7,8, p. 22-27.

Solomon, J. (August 16, 1993). "Mr. Vision, Meet Mr. Reality," Newsweek, 122, no.7, p.62-63.

State of North Carolina v. Whittle Communications, 402 S.E. 2d 556 (N.C. 1991).

Stewart, J. (October 31, 1994). " Grand Illusion", The New Yorker, vol. LXX, no.35, pp. 64-81.

Supovitz, J. (March 15, 1991)."Tuning in on Current Events: The Uses and Effects of Video News Programs in High Schools in Mississippi and North Carolina." (unpublished research report: executive summary) Research Triangle Park, NC: The Southeastern Educational Improvement Laboratory, Duke U.

Thompson, M. et al. (February 5-9, 1992). "Channel One in the Classroom: Does It Make a Difference?" Washington, D.C., Paper presented at the Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

Tiene, D. (May 1993.) "Channel One: Good or Bad News for our Schools? " Educational Leadership, 50, no.8, p.46.

Tiene, D. (May 1993)." Exploring the Effectiveness of the Channel One School Telecasts." Educational Technology vol.33, no.5, pp. 36-42.

Toch, T., (November 9, 1992). "Homeroom Sweepstakes: Channel One," U.S. News and World Report, 113, no.18, p. 86-90.

Walsh, M. (May 12, 1993). "Whittle Fights to Open Door for Channel One in N,Y.," Education Week p.5.

Wartella, E. (February, 1995). "Channel One: The Delimma of Teaching and Selling," Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 76, no. 6, pp. 448-451.

Wax, R. (1985). Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Chicago, ILL.: U. of Chicago Press (Midway Reprint).

Wulfemeyer, K.T.(Fall 1992) "Channel One and Commercials in Classrooms: Advertising Content Aimed at Students," Journalism Quarterly, vol.69, no.3, pp.724-42.

Wulfemeyer, K.T., & Mueller, B. (August 1-4, 1990). "Commercials in the Classroom: A Content Analysis of Channel One Advertisements." Paper

presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Minneapolis, MN, August. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 325 575)

Yeager, E. and Pandiscio, E. (May l993). "Newscasts in the Classroom," Educational Leadership, vol.50, no.8., p. 52-53.

Yin, R. (l989). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.